'O:	Mail Stop 8	OLICITOR REPORT ON THE	-
Director of the U	S. Patent and Trademark O	filing or determination of AN	
	P.O. Box 1450 A	UG 1 6 2007 ACTION REGARDING A PATENT OR	- }
Alexa	ndria, VA 22313-1450	TRADEMARK OFFICE TRADEMARK	
in Compliant	te with 35 U.S.C. § 290 and/or 19 Eastern Dist	U.S.C. § 1116 you are hereby advised that a court action has been crict of Kentucky on the following Patents or Trademarks:	
OCKET NO.	DATE FILED	U.S. DISTRICT COURT	
05-cv-458-JMH LAINTIFF	10/27/05	Fastern District of Kentucky at Lexington DEFENDANT	
Krançás Realty,	LLC .	Kimberly Bradley Brunson	
,,		d/b/a Hunter Real Estate Group	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	
¹ 014485		Kimberly Bradley Brunson d/b/a Hunter Real	
² 014486		Same as above	Group
³ 014487		Same as above	
4			
5			
In the abo	ve—entitled case, the following p	patent(s)/ trademark(s) have been included:	
DATE INCLUDED	INCLUDED BY	ndment Answer Cross Bill Other Pleading	
PATENT OR TRADEMARK NO.	DATE OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	HOLDER OF PATENT OR TRADEMARK	_
1			
2			_
3			
4			
5			
in the she	on entitled case the following	decision has been rendered or judgement issued:	

CLERK

Leslie G. Whitmer

(BY) DEPUTY CLERK

Kolleen Reynolds

DATE

8/10/07

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT EASTERN DISTRICT OF KENTUCKY

LEXINGTON				
FRANCIS REALTY, LLC,)			
)			
Plaintiff,) Civil Action No. 05-458-JMH			
)			
V.)			
) ORDER			
KIMBERLY BRADLEY BRUNSON,)			
and HUNTER REAL ESTATE &)			
ASSOCIATES, LLC,)			
)			
Defendants.)			
* *	** ** **			

On October 27, 2005, Plaintiff filed a notice of removal from Fayette Circuit Court [Record No. 1]. Plaintiff's initial complaint was filed in state court on August 30, 2005, and it alleged violations of the Lanham Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1051 et seq., and various state laws, all arising out of the same set of facts. Defendants answered and asserted several counterclaims based on state and federal law on September 28, 2005.

The general removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a), applies to "defendants," and Plaintiff claims that it is entitled to removal because it is a "defendant" to counterclaims based on federal law. However, while "[s]everal sections [of the U.S. Code] permit removal by defendants. . . . No section provides for removal by a plaintiff." Hamilton v. Aetna Life & Cas. Co., 5 F.3d 642, 643 (2d Cir. 1993) (affirming an order to remand after a plaintiff

Before removal, Plaintiff also filed an amended complaint reflecting the federally registered trademark claimed by Defendant Hunter Real Estate, which Plaintiff had not known of when it filed its initial complaint.

improperly removed based on a federal counterclaim); see also Ballard's Serv. Ctr., Inc. v. Transue, 865 F.2d 447, 449 (1st Cir. 1989) (holding that plaintiffs cannot remove). As Wright and Miller put it, "[p]laintiffs cannot remove, even when they are in the position of a defendant with regard to a counterclaim asserted against them." Charles Alan Wright et al., 14 Federal Practice and Procedure § 3731 at 253 (3d ed. 1998) (listing many cases in which courts have remanded cases after plaintiffs have filed for removal based on federal counterclaims).

Removal jurisdiction exists to protect defendants, and there is no purpose served by allowing a plaintiff who chose to submit to the jurisdiction of the state court to remove its own case, especially when the plaintiff's own claim included the same type of federal allegations as the counterclaims. Nor is there any statutory basis for allowing removal in these circumstances.

Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that this action be, and the same hereby is, REMANDED to Fayette Circuit Court.

This the 31st day of October, 2005.



Signed By:

Joseph M. Hood Cymy
United States District Judge